REMARKS:

The Office Action dated November 8, 2005, has been carefully considered. In response thereto, the present paper is submitted. In view of this paper and, in particular, the arguments presented below, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and issuance a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-11, 13-19, 22-24, 26, 27, 29, and 30 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 13, 22, and 26 are the only independent claims.

In the Office Action, allowed claims 13 and 14 and indicated that claims 15-19 (which depend on claim 1) and claims 27 and 29-30 (which depend on claim 26), would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 1-11, 22-24, and 26 are indicated as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,263,558 to *Yamaoka*. Finally, the Examiner states that the arguments presented in the paper filed on October 14, 2005, are moot in view of the new ground of rejection of the claims.

The following remarks are believed to address each of those objections and rejections.

Allowed and Allowable Claims

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that claim 13 and dependent claim 14 are allowed because of "the extension of the magnetization with respect to the axis." The Examiner's allowance of those claims is acknowledged and appreciated. It is noted for the record that claim 13 actually recites a "transducer comprising a member having a structure which extends generally radially of an axis to transmit a stress between a radially inner region of the structure and a radially outer region, and a single region of permanent magnetisation which extends obliquely to said axis and is disposed between said inner and outer regions to be responsive to the transmitted stress and emanate a stress-dependent magnetic field." Thus, there are other reasons that claims 13 and 14 are allowable over the prior art.

Rejection of Claims 1-11, 22-24, and 26:

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-11, 22-24, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over the *Yamaoka* patent. Of those claims, only claims 1, 22, and 26 are independent claims. For the reasons noted below, the Examiner's rejection of those claims is respectfully traversed.

First, with regard to claim 1, it is submitted that the *Yamaoka* patent does not disclose permanently magnetized regions that are "predominantly axially magnetized." Rather, they are radially magnetized as shown in Figure 3, where each magnet 40, 42, 44, 46, 48, 50, 52, and 54 has its north and south poles disposed radially from one another (see also column 3, lines 38-43, describing the same). Moreover, the *Yamaoka* patent does not disclose a device that "emanate[s] a stress-dependent magnetic field," as recited in claim 1. Rather, the stress is induced by the magnetic field interactions with coils 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, and 30, and those magnets emanate the same magnetic field irrespective of the amount of stress present (see also column 4, lines 12-17). It is therefore submitted that the Examiner has not established that the *Yamaoka* patent anticipates claim 1 (or dependent claims 2-11).

Second, with regard to claim 22, it is submitted that the *Yamaoka* patent does not disclose "first and second annular regions that are predominantly axially magnetized and having independent closed magnetic circuits with opposite polarity to generate a magnetic field component which is a function of said torque or force" (emphasis added). In fact, there does not appear to be anything in the *Yamaoka* patent that suggests that the magnetic fields emanating from the permanent magnets are altered in any way as a function of applied stress or force. It is therefore submitted that the Examiner has not established that the *Yamaoka* patent anticipates claim 22 (or dependent claims 23 and 24).

Finally, with regard to claim 26, it is submitted that the *Yamaoka* patent does not disclose "a disc member extending generally radially" or that the magnetic regions "cooperate to generate a magnetic field component that is a function of a stress." As noted above, there does not appear to be anything in the *Yamaoka* patent that suggests that the magnetic fields emanating from the permanent magnets are altered in any way as a function of applied stress. Therefore, they cannot cooperate to generate a magnetic field that is a function of a stress. Moreover, as noted above, the *Yamaoka* patent does not disclose permanently magnetized regions that are "predominantly axially magnetized." Rather, they

are radially magnetized as shown in Figure 3, where each magnet 40, 42, 44, 46, 48, 50, 52, and 54 has its north and south poles disposed radially from one another (see also column 3, lines 38-43, describing the same). It is therefore submitted that the Examiner has not established that the *Yamaoka* patent anticipates claim 26.

For the above reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection of claims 1-11, 22-24, and 26 are respectfully requested.